

METROPOLITAN
TRANSPORTATION
COMMISSION

Joseph P. Bort MetroCenter 101 Eighth Street Oakland, CA 94607-4700 TEL 510.817.5700 TDD/TTY 510.817.5769 FAX 510.817.5848 E-MAIL info@mtc.ca.gov WEB www.mtc.ca.gov

Memorandum

TO: Partnership Technical Advisory Committee DATE: May 21, 2007

FR: Sri Srinivasan

RE: MTC Proposed Call for Projects for P-TAP Round-9

Call for Projects for P-TAP Round 9:

MTC staff seeks the Working Group's feedback on proposed changes for Pavement Management Technical Assistance Program (P-TAP) Round-9.

Background on P-TAP:

To receive funds for pavement maintenance and rehabilitation projects through California's State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), a local jurisdiction is required under State Highway Code Section 2108.1 to develop and periodically update a certified Pavement Management System (PMS). The Pavement Management Technical Assistance Program was created to provide Bay Area cities and counties with consultant assistance for implementing or maintaining a pavement management system through roadway condition assessments. P-TAP is funded by federal STP funds that require collecting a non-federal match.

Highlighted Changes to P-TAP Round-9:

Staff is proposing the following changes to the Call for Projects for P-TAP Round-9 as compared to previous P-TAP Call for projects. Significant changes to P-TAP are outlined below.

• Local Contribution

P-TAP has been a huge success over the years, with jurisdictions submitting more applications for participation in the program than can be funded. To help ensure that those jurisdictions that truly need and want the assistance can receive funding, as well as to provide additional services through the P-TAP program, the project sponsor will be required to provide a local non-federal contribution of 20 percent of the grant project amount. Of this amount, 11.47 percent will be counted as the match to the federal funds.

• StreetSaver Subscription

MTC provides a standardized PMS called StreetSaver that was developed in house. In order to maintain and sustain StreetSaver, MTC charges the local jurisdictions a subsidized annual fee of \$1,000. Because it is difficult for some jurisdictions to pay the annual fee, some have opted in the past to use the local contribution portion of the grant money for P-TAP to pay for the software as part of the consultant services. Now that 108 of 109 local jurisdictions in the MTC region use StreetSaver as their Pavement Management System, a two or three-year subscription to the online version of StreetSaver will be included in P-TAP. This will

Partnership Technical Advisory Committee

May 21, 2007 Page 2 of 2

facilitate the processing of StreetSaver accounts, by providing multi-year, rather than annual purchase arrangements, as well as ease the accounting burden for jurisdictions by having a single transaction for both P-TAP and StreetSaver. This will also help cities that currently use older versions of the system to upgrade to the latest on-line version.

• Minimum/Maximum

To allow jurisdictions to have more of their streets assessed under P-TAP and provide other efficiencies, the minimum amount to be awarded will be \$7,500 with a cap of \$40,000 (in previous programs there was no minimum and the cap was \$25,000).

• Local Streets and Roads Revenue Survey

Every few years, MTC requests local jurisdictions to complete a Local Streets and Roads Revenue Survey. The information from the survey is used to comply with federal financial constraint requirements for the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and Regional Transportation Program (RTP), as well as for regional advocacy for Local Streets and Roads funding. The data from this survey is used in updating the needs assessment for Local Streets and roads. The needs assessment is vital to maintain existing levels of funding, as well as securing additional funding. Because of the importance of the revenue survey, only jurisdictions that have satisfactorily completed the latest needs assessment survey will be eligible for P-TAP funding.

• Timely Submittal of Local Contribution

In the past, MTC has had difficulty receiving the contribution from local jurisdictions. Since the majority of the program is funded with federal funds, it is crucial that the required match is received. Therefore, jurisdictions that have not submitted their required contribution by the established deadline will be subject to removal from the program. MTC will then fund the next applicant(s) on the list.

For your information, a list of P-TAP recipients from Round-8 is attached. Also, the draft application has been included to solicit feedback.

The Local Streets and Roads Working group may want to consider additional funding for P-TAP in the reauthorization of SAFETEA.

J:\PROJECT\Funding\Regional Streets and Roads\P-TAP\P-TAP 9\P-TAP-9 Memo 05-04-07.doc

P-TAP RECIPIENTS - ROUNDS 1 - 8

	EDA COUNTY	Dov 4/->	DT	AD E 1-		A CLARA COUNTY	Dov 4/->	חת	AD E1
No.	Jurisdiction	Round(s)		AP Funds	No.	Jurisdiction	Round(s)		AP Funds
1	Alameda County	4,7	\$	39,839	55	Santa Clara Co.	3,4,6	\$	43,134
2	Alameda	1,5,8	\$	64,535	56	Campbell	2,5,7,8	\$	75,178
3	Albany	3,5	\$	27,975	57	Cupertino	2,4,7	\$	53,999
4	Berkeley	4	\$	15,670	58	Gilroy	3,6	\$	53,119
5	Dublin	1,4,6,8	\$	74,622	59	Los Altos	2,6,7	\$	55,815
6	Emeryville	1,7	\$	9,502	60	Los Altos Hills	1,5,7	\$	42,704
7	Fremont	3,5	\$	48,692	61	Los Gatos	2,4,5,7	\$	77,473
8	Hayward	2,3,6	\$	69,847	62	Milpitas	2,3,6,8	\$	84,897
9	Livermore	3,5,7	\$	47,762	63	Monte Sereno	1,3,5,7	\$	23,416
10	Newark	5,7,8	\$	61,972	64	Morgan Hill	2,4,7	\$	56,557
11	Oakland	3,5,6	\$	71,095	65	Mountain View	3,7	\$	38,068
12	Piedmont	1,4,6,8	\$	43,446	66	Palo Alto	8	\$	22,133
13	Pleasanton	3,6,7	\$	63,299	67	San Jose	3,5,8	\$	70,825
14	San Leandro	2,3,5,7	\$	68,965	68	Santa Clara	3,7	\$	53,119
15	Union City	8	\$	22,133	69	Saratoga	3,6,8	\$	71,480
					70	Sunnyvale	6,8	\$	44,265
	RA COSTA COUNTY	D (()	DIT	.D.F. 1	G 4 3 7 3	ALTER COLUMN			
No.	Jurisdiction	Round(s)		AP Funds		IATEO COUNTY		-	
16	Contra Costa Co.	5	\$	17,706	No.	Jurisdiction	Round(s)		AP Funds
17	Antioch	2,4,8	\$	53,069	71	San Mateo Co.	3,5,6	\$	61,972
18	Brentwood	3,8	\$	53,119	72	Atherton	2,5,7	\$	38,379
19	Clayton	3,7	\$	25,107	73	Belmont	2,4,6,8	\$	67,938
20	Concord	8	\$	22,133	74	Brisbane	2,5,6,7	\$	35,837
21	Danville	2,3,8	\$	65,420	75	Burlingame	4,6,8	\$	61,617
22	El Cerrito	3,5	\$	41,786	76	Colma	2,5,7	\$	7,811
23	Hercules	1,6,8	\$	43,305	77	Daly City	1,4,7	\$	56,124
24	Lafayette	1,5	\$	30,936	78	E. Palo Alto	1,4,6,8	\$	39,931
25	Martinez	2,4,5,8	\$	64,535	79	Foster City	2,4,6,7	\$	38,002
26	Moraga	8	\$	14,076	80	Half Moon Bay	3,6	\$	21,425
27	Oakley	2,8	\$	38,712	81	Hillsborough	1,5,8	\$	57,300
28	Orinda	2,6	\$	42,860	82	Menlo Park	4,7,8	\$	49,136
29	Pinole	3,7	\$	35,766	83	Millbrae	4,5,7	\$	35,114
30	Pittsburg	2,4,6,8	\$	84,100	84	Pacifica	2,3,7	\$	65,437
31	Pleasant Hill	2,7	\$	36,245	85	Portola Valley	2,5,7,8	\$	38,117
32	Richmond	2,3,5,7	\$	79,150	86	Redwood City	2,4,6,8	\$	71,562
33	San Pablo	1,4	\$	22,671	87	San Bruno	4,7	\$	39,839
34	San Ramon	6,8	\$	44,265	88	San Carlos	1,4	\$	33,141
35	Walnut Creek	7	\$	22,133	89	San Mateo	3,7	\$	45,151
					90	So. S.F.	1,3,6	\$	69,847
	N COUNTY				91	Woodside	1,4,6,8	\$	47,812
No.	Jurisdiction	Round(s)		AP Funds					
36	Marin County	4,8	\$	38,865		NO COUNTY			
37	Belvedere	1,4,7	\$	9,661	No.	Jurisdiction	Round(s)		AP Funds
38	Corte Madera	2	\$	5,954	92	Benicia	1,4,6	\$	32,333
39	Fairfax	1,4,6,8	\$	30,210	93	Dixon	1,4,6,8	\$	43,265
40	Larkspur	2,5,7	\$	34,482	94	Fairfield	5,7	\$	39,839
41	Mill Valley	1,4,6,8	\$	52,842	95	Rio Vista	4,7	\$	13,014
42	Novato	3,4,7	\$	55,774	96	Suisun City	1,4,8	\$	52,573
43	Ross	1,4,7	\$	11,276	97	Vacaville	2,7	\$	46,697
44	San Anselmo	2,3,8	\$	34,051	98	Vallejo	6,7	\$	32,756
45	San Rafael	3,5	\$	33,641					
46	Sausalito	3,6	\$	16,732	SONO	MA COUNTY			
47	Tiburon	2,6,7	\$	59,804	No.	Jurisdiction	Round(s)	PT	AP Funds
					99	Sonoma Co.	5,6	\$	39,839
NAPA	COUNTY				100	Cloverdale	1,4	\$	6,374
No.	Jurisdiction	Round(s)	PT	AP Funds	101	Cotati	2	\$	5,513
48	American Canyon	7	\$	5,949	102	Healdsburg	6	\$	11,420
49	Calistoga	1,4,5,6,8	\$	25,105	103	Petaluma	3,5,7,8	\$	92,957
50	Napa	8	\$	22,133	104	Rohnert Park	1,4	\$	36,228
51	Napa County	1,4,6	\$	53,069	105	Santa Rosa	6	\$	22,133
52	St. Helena	8	\$	6,905	106	Sebastopol	2,4,8	\$	18,041
53	Yountville	1,7	\$	3,665	107	Sonoma	1,4,7	\$	24,275
	* =====	-,,	Ψ	2,300	108	Windsor	2,5,7	\$	52,975
SAN F	RANCISCO COUNTY						/= , .	-	- ,
No.	Jurisdiction	Round(s)	PT	AP Funds					
	City/County of SF	3,4,5,6	\$	79,585					
54	City/County of 51	3,4.3.0							

RATING CRITERIA FOR P-TAP 9 PROJECTS

<u>No.</u>	<u>Description</u>	Score Range
1	Scope of Work Requested Jurisdictions applying for reinspection-type projects will receive higher scores.	10 to 15 points
2	Centerline Miles Jurisdictions with fewer centerline miles will receive higher scores.	5 to 15 points
3	Prior P-TAP Recipient Jurisdictions who have never received P-TAP funds in the past will receive higher scores.	5 to 15 points
4	<u>Certification Status</u> Jurisdictions without current PMP certification will receive higher scores.	10 to 20 points
5	Amount of Funds Requested Jurisdictions requesting less funding for projects will receive higher scores.	10 to 15 points
6	Preventative Maintenance Jurisdictions with strong preventative maintenance programs in place will receive higher scores.	0 to 20 points
	Maximum Score	100 points
*BONUS	LS&R Needs and Revenue Survey Jurisdictions who turned in their surveys to MTC will receive five bonus points.	5 points
	LS&R Needs and Revenue Survey with Useable Data	
	Jurisdictions who turned in their surveys to MTC with valid data will receive an additional five bonus points	5 points

METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

PAVEMENT MANAGEMENT TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM (P-TAP) ROUND 9 APPLICATION FORM

Deadline: June 22nd, 2007

_	ne of Jurisdiction: Iress:				
2. Cor	ntact Person #1: Name: Title: Phone: Fax: Email:	Contact Person # Name: Title: Phone: Fax: Email:	ł2:		
JURISDICT	ION INFORMATION				
3. Tota	al number of centerline miles within jurisd	iction:			
4. Nur	nber of full time engineering staff on payro	oll:			
	mber of staff working with pavement mana If using the MTC PMS, have staff attend	agement:			
6. 200	6-2007 Pavement Maintenance Budget (i	ncl. engineering, labor	, & materials):		\$
<i>Bre</i> a. b. c. d.	akdown Sealing and Patching (incl. Crack, Slurry, Ch Overlays: Reconstruction: Stop-gap (e.g. pothole patching):	ip, and Cape seals):			\$ \$ \$ \$
7. 200	6-2007 Preventive Maintenance Budget (any treatment on a roa	ad w/ a PCI>70)	\$
PAVEMENT	MANAGEMENT SYSTEM				
	ve you acquired MTC Pavement Manager What version? (incl. Service release #) Last network inspection completed in what I. Percent of network inspected? II. If a reinspection cycle is established, where Level of information revised last in what I. Inspection data input (no PCIs determine II. Applied pavement treatment date in Fill. PCIs calculated IV. Budget Options Report completed	nat year? what is it? year?	Yes	No	(If No, go to #9)
9. If no	ot using MTC PMS, what software are you	u currently using?			
-	ve you utilized PMS consultants before? If yes, which consultant? Do you have any preference for your cor If yes, which consultant?	nsultant?	Yes	No	<u> </u>
11. Do	you have a digital map (e.g. GIS) of your - If yes, what format?	jurisdiction?	Yes	No	_
12. Hav	ve you linked your basemap to your PMS	database?	Yes	No	

SCOPE OF WORK

Please select one or more Projects from No. 12-15. If you are interested in more than one project, To indicate your prioritization place "1-4" in the boxes.

(Juri	isdictions interested in Projects No. 14-16 MUST have an updated PMS in place	e before these projects will b	e funded)			
13.	Pavement Management System (PMS) Projects					
	Project will include ALL tasks listed (items a - h), unless otherwise agreed upon by MTC. A BOR must					
	be completed, either by the consultant or the jurisdiction itself, and subm	nitted to MTC by Septembe	er 30, 2008.			
	 a. Break Network into Management Sections (for new PMS impleted) b. Update PMS Road Network (e.g. create new management section) c. Inspect Management Sections (visual pavement distress surveys) - Estimated no. of centerline miles to be inspected: No. of centerline miles% of network No. of pavement management system miles (if different from control includes (please check all that apply): Arterials Collectors - Estimated no. of management sections to be inspected: - Estimated no. of inspection units to be inspected: Update Treatment Decision Tree and Unit Costs Update Maintenance and Repair (M&R) History f. Establish Pavement Needs (current PCI, backlog), & Projet g. Perform Budget Scenarios Analysis 	ementation only) ns, combine/delete sections s and measurements out in t enterline miles)ResidentialsOtherNo. of ManageNo. of Inspecti	he field) % of network ement Sections on Units			
	- Run, at a minimum, the three scenarios required for PMF	certification.				
	 h. Complete a Budget Options Report (Budget Analysis) i. Present Report to Management and/or City Council j. Provide assistance for federal/state funding requests 					
14.	MTC PMP/Geographical Information System (GIS) Linkage Pro	<u>ojects</u>				
<u> </u>	a. Provide assistance in developing PS&E design work for spand/or reconstruction projects. (Note: PS&E is typically 19 Please briefly describe the project, including the length and width of as the functional classification and current PCI of the streets involved any work to be done beyond the general pavement rehabilitation and current PCI of the streets involved any work to be done beyond the general pavement rehabilitation and current PCI of the streets involved any work to be done beyond the general pavement rehabilitation and current PCI of the streets involved any work to be done beyond the general pavement rehabilitation and current PCI of the streets involved any work to be done beyond the general pavement rehabilitation and current PCI of the streets involved any work to be done beyond the general pavement rehabilitation and current PCI of the streets involved any work to be done beyond the general pavement rehabilitation and current PCI of the streets involved any work to be done beyond the general pavement rehabilitation and current PCI of the streets involved any work to be done beyond the general pavement rehabilitation and current PCI of the streets involved any work to be done beyond the general pavement rehabilitation and current PCI of the streets involved any work to be done beyond the general pavement rehabilitation and current PCI of the streets involved and the properties are the properties	No. of sections Sounde Cost Estimates (PS&E) Decific pavement rehals 5-20% of the construct of the proposed project, as ed. Please also indicate if d reconstruction work (ie.	oilitation, ion cost) well there is			
	Please indicate the date you plan for this project to go to constructi	on:				
	Please also list what you anticipate the total project budget will be:		\$			
16.	Other Projects (please specify)					
PROJE	CT BUDGET					
17.	TOTAL PROJECT COST (Sum of lines 18 & 19) - Calculated at \$300 multiplied by number of centerline miles with \$7,500 Minir	num & \$40,000 Maximum.	\$			
18.	Amount of P-TAP funds requested from MTC (Maximum = \$32,00	0)	\$			
19.	Local contribution (Must be at least 20% of total project cost, Maximum Local contribution is due to MTC prior to the start of the project, and no.		\$			
20.	Have you received P-TAP grants before?	Yes N	0			
	Does your jurisdiction have additional funds available to pay fo P-TAP grant amount?	r a project whose cost Yes N				
Signatu	re of Public Works Director:	Phone:				
Name o	of Public Works Director:	E-mail:				

Mail Application to: Sri Srinivasan, MTC, 101 Eighth Street, Oakland, CA 94607-4700 Fax Application to: 510-817-5848